

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA SOUTH BEND DIVISION

· 5

0

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CONSOLIDATED RAIL CORPORATION,

a/k/a CONRAIL

Defendant.

)

Defendant.

STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF DUVAL)

The deposition of J. M. McGUIGAN, taken on behalf of the Plaintiff, pursuant to Notice of Deposition of James McGuigan, in the above-entitled action, commencing at approximately 10:00 a.m., on Tuesday, February 23, 1993, at the U.S. Attorney's Office, 311 West Monroe Street, Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida, before Elizabeth M. Baxley, RPR-CP, and a Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at Large.

AAA REPORTERS 705 Blackstone Building Jacksonville, Florida 32202 (904) 354-4789

24

25

1 APPEARANCES 2 PETER H. RUVOLO, Esquire 3 Trial Attorney Environmental Enforcement Section Environment and Natural Resources Division 5 United States Department of Justice Post Office Box 7611 Ben Franklin Station 6 Washington, D.C. 20044 On behalf of the United States of America 7 8 JAMES A. ERMILIO, Esquire 9 Of the law firm of 10 Bingham, Dana & Gould Suite 1200 11 1550 M Street, Northwest Washington, D.C. 20005 12 Attorneys for Consolidated Rail Corporation 13 a/k/a Conrail 14 PIERCE E. CUNNINGHAM, Esquire 15 Of the law firm of 16 Frost & Jacobs 2500 Central Trust Center 17 201 East Fifth Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 18 Attorneys for Penn Central Corporation 19 20 21 22

TABLE QF CQNTENTS

2	WITNESS	405
3	<u>WITNESS</u> P	AGE
4	J. M. McGUIGAN	
5		
6	Direct Examination By Mr. Ruvolo	4
7	Cross-Examination By Mr. Cunningham	28
8		20
9	Cross-Examination By Mr. Ermilio	35
10	Further Cross-Examination By Mr. Cunningham	38
11	Redirect Examination	30
12	By Mr. Ruvolo	39
13		
14		
15		
16	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	
17	FOR IDENTIFICATION:	
18	Plaintiff's Exhibit A	16
19		
20		
21		
2 2		
2 3		
24		
25		

STIPULATION

It was stipulated and agreed by and between counsel for the respective parties, and the witness,

J. M. McGUIGAN, that the reading and signing of the following deposition be waived.

J. M. McGUIGAN,

having been produced and first duly sworn as a witness on behalf of the Plaintiff herein, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RUVOLO:

Q Good morning, Mr. McGuigan. My name is Peter Ruvolo, and I'm an attorney with the Justice Department, and we represent the Environmental Protection Agency.

We've brought this civil action against

Conrail in regards to alleged groundwater contamination

out at the Elkhart Yard in Indiana.

I think you know -- you've met Mr. Ermilio, who is an attorney for Conrail, and Mr. Cunningham, who represents Penn Central, which was the predecessor to Conrail.

If there's any question I ask that you don't understand, please don't hesitate to say so. If you

need a break or would like to take a break at any time, just raise your hand and we'll do that. And let's go from there.

Give us an address, please.

(b) (6)

Q And a telephone number at which you can be reached.

A Area Code (b) (6)

Q Mr. McGuigan, you were served with a notice to take deposition under subpoena, were you not, to be here today?

A I received a letter in the mail to James McGuigan, which is not my name.

Q I see. But you did receive it and you are here?

A Yeah

Q Okay. You were requested at that time, I think, to bring any documents that you might have in regard to your employment.

A Yeah.

Q Did you bring any documents?

A No.

Q There was a cover letter with that notice, was there not, advising you that you were not a party

Central.

1

to this action --

```
Yes.
2
          Α
               -- and that you had a right to counsel if you
3
     so desired.
                   And you chose not to, correct?
               (Nods head affirmatively.) Right.
5
               She can't hear the nod.
6
               Okay. Tell us a little bit about yourself.
7
     You're now retired?
8
9
          Α
               Yes.
               And when did you retire?
          Q
10
11
               January 1, 1987.
               And how long had you been with the railroad?
12
          Q
               I retired from CSX. I had been with -- I was
13
          Α
     employed by CSX from April the 4th, 1976.
14
          Q
               Who is CSX?
15
               That is the merged corporation consisting of
16
17
     Seaboard Coast Line, Atlantic Coast Line, L & N,
     Clinchfield, Chessie System, B & O and Western
18
19
     Maryland.
20
               Have you had any relationship at all with Penn
     Central?
21
          Α
               Yes.
22
23
          Q
               In what capacity?
               Prior to April 1, 1976, I was employed by Penn
24
```

The last position I had was chief mechanical

1	officer.
2	Q And how long had you been with Penn Central?
3	A Since it was formed by the merger of the New
4	York Central and the Pennsylvania Railroad.
5	Q And have you ever had anything to do, or were
6	you employed with Conrail?
7	A No. I was never employed by Conrail.
8	Q And as chief mechanical officer, where were
9	you stationed, or where was your
10	A In Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
11	Q And what were your functions and
12	responsibilities overall.
13.	A I had the overall responsibility for the
14	maintenance and repair of all the rolling stock of the
15	Penn Central Railroad. Locomotives and freight cars,
16	primarily. And the passenger cars. Prior to Amtrak.
17	Q Did you have anything to do with tank cars?
18	A I didn't hear you.
19	Q Did you have anything to do with tank cars?
20	As contrasted to freight cars.
21	A Tank cars?
22	Q Uh-huh. The cars that, you know, they
23	A I know. I know what you're talking about.]
24	don't they're like any other car. I mean

Uh-huh.

Q

- A -- we had to keep them under repair, and keep them going, and inspect them and so on and so forth.
- Q And as chief mechanical officer, did you actually run a shop, or were you in charge as supervisor for other mechanical officers in various yards?
- A I was the -- I was on the staff of the president.
 - Q Uh-huh.
- A And, as such, my primary responsibility was to develop the practices and the policies that the company generated for the repair of their equipment. And a major part of my responsibility was the budgetary controls and restraints that were necessary, because we were in bankruptcy.
- Q Was part of your responsibility the determination of the ordering of materials and supplies for the repairs?
- A The actual ordering of the materials and supplies was done by our purchasing department.
- Q But did you have a say in what was ordered or what type of equipment or materials were used?
- A Well, if a supplier would come in with a commodity that he or his firm claimed were the superior to some others that we were using, we would, of course,

investigate that, particularly if it was more cost effective.

Q Okay.

3 -

9 .

A We had a small group of engineers, chemists, I believe, that this type of commodity would be referred to. And they would investigate it, and either accept it or reject it.

Q So, for example, if a material was declared possibly hazardous, it would not be your function to determine that, whether it should be used or not, but it might be determined by the chemists or somebody in that department? If there was to be a change in the use of a material or a product, for example, that you were using?

A Well, we certainly wouldn't use anything that would be in violation of any -- tóxic, or, you know -- from an environmental stand. I mean, we wouldn't do that.

Q No, I know you would not do that intentionally.

But, there were products at one point that were used on a day-to-day basis by everybody in this country. For example, carbon tetrachloride was used as a cleaning fluid by tailor shops. Then came a point where it was declared a hazardous material, and a new

product would be used. And that was taken off or reduced -- the usage was reduced.

Would that be a function of yours or would that be a function of somebody else in Penn Central who would say: Stop using this product and start using this product, because it's less hazardous, or it's nonhazardous?

A Well, if the product were going to be used in the maintenance of equipment, it would be the responsibility of my group to determine if that met all the environmental regulations.

Now, if it were going to be -- if the product was going to be used for some other purpose, such as clean a building, or painting a bridge, or stripping paint from a structure or something, that would be the responsibility of the user department that was in charge of that work.

If it was going to be used on cars and locomotives, it would be the mechanical department's responsibility. So, it all depends on what the product was designed for.

Q Do you recall what products were in use other than -- I mean, I know you have the actual parts to the locomotives or the engines. But, other than that, do you recall what kind of products were used for cleaning

or degreasing or something of that nature?

- A I do not recall.
- Q Did you, prior to becoming the chief mechanical officer, did you yourself work on repairing locomotives or freight cars or others?

A When I first started to work for the Pennsylvania Railroad, in March of 1948, after I graduated from college, I started on a training program, a management-training program. And we were moved around the system, actually observing firsthand the work that was going on on the floor, so to speak.

Then we were placed in different levels of supervision and, depending upon our progress and development and so forth, we were promoted to higher and higher positions.

So, when it comes right down to actually having a job as a mechanic in a diesel shop, no, I never did. Or a job as a car repair repairman in a car yard, no, I never did. I -- I was -- that wasn't the type of work that I was doing.

- Q Yours was more of an administrative function?
- A Exactly.
- Q Your responsibility was the operation of the department as a whole, not a particular --
 - A That's right.

Q -- job, per se.

You mentioned before that, in '76, that was the period that Penn Central was involved in the bankruptcy situation. Was there a change in policy or a change in attitude at Penn Central because of that situation?

A What --

- Q Well, I mean, I imagine --
- A It went into bankruptcy in 1970.
- Q Right. I imagine there were some cost-cutting measures taken.

A Well, certainly there was. Every nickel was squeezed as hard as it could. We were operating under very severe monetary restrictions. And every opportunity, you know, that came up, that would permit us to perform our work properly but at less cost, we could adopt, naturally.

During that period of time, rather than -rather than cut corners as far as, you know, safety was
concerned, I elected to start a program of massive
retirement of equipment. We retired many, many, many,
many freight cars that were right on the borderline as
far as being repaired or not being repaired, because we
had just so many maintenance dollars, and they had to
be spent very wisely.

And rather than try to spread that out over the entire fleet of 200,000 freight cars, we elected to start a policy of attrition, rapid attrition of the equipment, and thereby we could spend our money on freight cars that were more up to date, and at the same time do a reasonable job as far as keeping them running.

That was probably the -- well, that was our major policy, I suppose, during that period of time.

- Q Would you characterize it as a downsizing but a modernization --
 - A Right.
 - Q -- at the same time?
- A That's right. And we kept the place running up until, you know, Conrail took it over.
- Q Did Penn Central own most of these freight cars, or did they --

A Well, yes and no. They -- I think most of them were probably on equipment trusts, which was a form of leasing. Later on, most of it was leasing. Earlier on, it was equipment trust financing that was done.

- Q How about the locomotives?
- A Same thing.
 - Q Same thing.

Were there particular yards that did repairs of locomotives or freight cars or tank cars?

A Yes, yes, yes. We -- that's another thing that we started. We couldn't afford to keep all the shops open, so we would close several of them and concentrate our efforts on the major points. Rather than have them all cut up, die on the vine, we elected to eliminate an awful lot of facilities or concentrate our work elsewhere, put our money where we had the more modern machinery, better skills, in the way of employees and so forth. That's the general of what we did.

- Q Are you familiar with some of the yards as to their specialty? For example, we had heard that Altoona was the key point for locomotive repairs.
 - A Altoona was. It was the major location.
- Q And Dearborn, was that another major setup, or --
 - A Dearborn?
- Q Yeah. Was there anything? Or did that come afterwards with Conrail, after Penn Central? Dearborn, Michigan, did you have any facilities out there? Or Chicago?
- A We didn't have any major mechanical facilities in Michigan.

24

25

way going out anyway.

1 0 Where else would they have been? 2 We had a major locomotive -- I presume you're asking about locomotives? 3 Yes. The major locomotive facility was in Juniata, 5 6 which was in Altoona, in the Altoona area. We also had a major locomotive repair point in Collingwood, outside of Cleveland. There were other locations that I would 8 9 not term as major, but they were important. 10 certainly Dearborn, there wasn't anything in Dearborn. 11 How about freight cars? Where? 12 Α 13 Q Freight cars. Oh, freight cars. 14 Α 15 As contrasted to locomotives. 16 Our major freight car repair shop was 17 Holidaysburg, Pennsylvania, which is outside of 18 Altoona. And also Beech Grove, Indiana, which we 19 successfully sold to Amtrak. 20 Uh-huh. 21 One other location that I had forgotten about 22 was Wilmington, Delaware, where we repaired our

Q What, if anything, was out at Elkhart?

electric locomotives. But they were pretty much on the

1	A Elkhart was not a major location.
2	Q For repairs
3	A For repairs.
4	Q equipment repairs.
5	A I would characterize Elkhart as primarily a
6	filling-station operation.
7	Q Was the humping operation in existence at
8	Elkhart?
9	A I believe so. But I'm not familiar with that
10	I believe they were humping.
14	Q Did you ever have anything to do with the
12	Elkhart Yard other than general overall supervision?
13	A No.
14	Q Mr. McGuigan, there was a memorandum that you
15	sent around way back when if I can find it which
16	I'd like to mark as Exhibit A, if you would. Let's le
17	her mark it, first.
18	(Thereupon, the document last-above referred
19	to was marked for identification as Plaintiff's
20	Exhibit A.)
21	MR. ERMILIO: That's Exhibit A, Peter?
2 2	MR. RUVOLO: Yes.
23	MR. CUNNINGHAM: Do you have an extra copy?
24	MR. RUVOLO: I'm really not going to go into
25	it line by line. You're welcome to look at it.

(Tendering document.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Sure.

BY MR. RUVOLO:

Q Just let me identify it a little better. It's a memorandum dated January 20th, 1975, the subject being electrical cleaners.

I was wondering if you could just tell us about the circumstances surrounding that memorandum, how it arose and what your purpose was and who these people were that you sent it to.

A Well, can I say something, explain this to you a little bit, our procedures and the way we operated on the railroad?

- Q Yes. But it can be on the record.
- A Okay. This letter is what I would term a desk ten letter.
 - Q Meaning?
- A Written by R.T.N., which, I believe, is Mr. Noonan, with a stenographer by the initials of W. Now, what the W stands for, I don't know. Wanda, or whatever her name might be.
 - Q I follow.
 - A Okay. Now, that's who wrote the letter.
- Q And who was Mr. Noonan? What was his position at the time?

A Mr. Noonan worked for Mr. Reed, and I believe Mr. Reed was our chief chemist. And he was a chemist that worked for Mr. Reed.

Now, without -- you've got to understand that this letter is, you know, 18 years old.

Q Okay.

A The normal procedure is that someone would come in with a product, as I explained before, be given to Mr. Reed. Mr. Reed would assign, probably, Mr. Noonan here to look into it. Mr. Noonan would look into it.

Apparently, he decided to make a change. All letters went out to the field over my signature irregardless (sic) of what they were. And he would prepare this letter, and it would go out. And these -- this over here -- you'll notice this copy over here went to Mr. Reed.

And Mr. Reed made this note. One of the people he sent it to was Mr. Noonan. And he changed Mr. Noonan's letter. You'll notice he said to Mr. Noonan: I have changed this letter by adding so many people to the top of it and so on and so forth.

Q So that is Mr. Reed's handwriting?

A Yeah, that's Mr. Reed. That's Ken Reed's handwriting, see.

24

25

department.

1 Q Okav. Now, this letter would --2 Α Q That's on page two. 3 That's on page two, yeah. 4 5 And who would the gentlemen be that are listed to be copied on that? 6 Oh, to be copies? Yes. On page two. 8 Well, let me see if I can answer that 9 Understand, it was 18 years ago. 10 question. I understand. 11 J. C. White was on my staff as general 12 13 superintendent of system shops. As such, he had overall jurisdiction of Holidaysburg, Juniata, 14 Collingwood, Beech Grove. 15 16 Q Okay. Feeley, I don't know who Feeley -- I don't 17 remember who Feeley is. 18 Dr. Simpson was our chief medical officer. 19 was the one that the various company nurses and company 20 doctors, they evidently reported to him. 21 Why would he be notified? 22

I don't know why he was notified, unless

there's something here that would involve the medical

25

1 Who is Feeley again? I'm sorry. Q 2 Α Huh? 3 Did you mention who Feeley was? I don't know who Feeley is. I may know, but I 5 . have forgotten. I mean, it's so long ago. 6 Sherron, I believe, is a purchasing agent. He 7 was probably the vehicle through which this commodity 8 came to us. That's generally the way it happens. Q 9 Okay. He would be the actual man that would purchase 10 11 the commodity. Right. One that was being substituted for the Q 12 13 other. Is that right? 14 Α Right. He takes over and he orders it. 15 16 А٠ He takes over and he orders it. 17 Zimmerman, I believe Zimmerman was our 18 materials man. He would distribute the product after it was ordered. It would be ordered and sent to a 19 20 central storehouse, and then he would perform the distribution of it to the various points. 21 22 Q I follow. Frank Manganaro, I remember him. He was our 23

environmental specialist. He was supposed to keep us

clean as far as the EPA was concerned. He was the

expert on all the environmental rules and regulations that were in effect --

Q Okay.

5.

A -- so he naturally would be a copier for this letter.

Q Okay.

A Ken Reed, as I said, he was the chief chemist. And Harley, E. T. Harley, he reported to Harley. Harley was our general superintendent of locomotive engineering, or equipment engineering, I believe was his title. He was on my staff.

Q And the gentlemen on the top were all --

A These were all -- let's see. Let's see, who were these people? These were all -- these were all regional people. They were out in the field. They were all out in the field.

Let me see, who was who here. These people here on the right were in the major shops. I think that's what Mr. Reed was referring to. The shop managers.

Q Okay.

A He put the shop managers' names at the top of this letter to also receive a copy. If you notice, that's what he put down here.

And Mr. Fadale, he was in Juniata. And

Boughton was in -- Boughton, Boughton, Boughton.]
believe Boughton was in Collingwood.

Thigpen was in Wilmington, Delaware. And Brennan, where was Brennan? I don't remember where Brennan was now. He could have been in Beech Grove, but I don't -- I don't -- I'm not sure.

- Q The original eight in the left column and the center column, they were just mechanical --
 - A Yeah, yeah.
 - Q -- in the mechanical department?
- A They were mechanical superintendents. Let's see, one was in New York, one was in Pittsburgh, one was in Detroit, one was in Indianapolis, one was in Chicago. I don't remember where he was now. I don't remember that.

But they were all basically out in the field.

- Q At that time, do you know who would have jurisdiction over the Elkhart Yard? Would it be Chicago, or would it be Indianapolis, or some other --
 - A I don't remember.
- Q Now, what would happen after a memo like this was issued? When I say "what would happen," what would happen to the original product? Would it be used up and then substituted as ordered when the new/product came in, or would it be destroyed, or what?

15 '

A Well, this letter says that the use of it would be -- the use of that type of cleaner will be discontinued effective immediately. So, they wouldn't use it, so I would presume they would do something with it. I don't know what they would do with it. I don't know.

I don't even -- I don't even -- I don't even know what this is, to tell you the truth.

Q Apparently some sort of a solvent which is used as a degreaser or something.

A Uh-huh.

Q You've never had any --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We object to the editorial comments. Not evidence. But I just want to note that.

MR. RUVOLO: Objection noted.

BY MR. RUVOLO:

Q You, yourself, had nothing personal to do with the ordering or the usage or anything of this equipment?

A Not at all.

Q Or of this substance?

A No, no. See, our practices were that these letters would go out -- I'll make an editorial comment off the record.

MR. RUVOLO: Off the record. (Off the record.)

BY MR. RUVOLO:

Q Keeping in mind, at the time, they may not have been considered hazardous materials, are you aware of any product that was used that might have contained carbon tetrachloride or tetrachloride ethylene or other materials that were subsequently considered hazardous?

A I'm not, no. No, I am not familiar with anything of that sort.

Q Are you aware of any changes that were made via the chemistry department or by Mr. Noonan or Mr. Reed because of changes in definition as to a hazardous material?

A Well, I imagine there were others. But I am not familiar with them, specifically. Those people were charged with the responsibility of seeing that the hazardous materials were not going to be used. And this is an indication that they were doing their job, as I look at it.

As far as I personally was concerned, I had no specific knowledge of any of this type of material.

Q Did any of your responsibilities cover the shipment --

A The what?

Q -- the shipment of materials containing those chemicals, or any other chemicals? Did any of your responsibilities as chief mechanical officer, did any of your responsibilities include the shipment of liquified materials or liquified chemicals?

A Well, other than the inspection of the cars themselves, no matter if it was shipped by a customer or by ourselves, we would make the air brake inspection of the car, we would check the wheels, make sure the car was safe to travel, that sort of thing. That would be our sole responsibility.

We would not route the car. We wouldn't put the car in a particular train. We wouldn't -- we may have had instructions as to where these cars were supposed to be located within a train, but we wouldn't have anything to do with that.

Q If there was an incident involving a major spill of a chemical, would you be called into it as part of your function, or would this be somebody else's responsibility?

A Back in the early '70s, when this was -- it still wasn't really a major -- it wasn't as important -- let me put it that way -- as it is today. We were just beginning to recognize -- the country was -- just beginning to -- and Congress -- just

beginning to realize the importance of -- the dangers of hazardous material.

And a fledgling department was pretty much being formed in Penn Central at that time. And Frank Manganaro, who was on my payroll, was a very important part of that. He was our director of environmental regulations, or something like that. I forget now.

But it's quite possible he would be called in. But it would only be well after the -- well after the fact. The wreck would probably be cleaned up and the cars rerailed. And, you know, it wouldn't be a responsibility -- it would be the operating department's responsibility to clean up a wreck and determine whether anything was hazardous or not.

They would be the ones that would have the waybills covering the contents of the car, and whether it was hazardous or nonhazardous.

It was pretty much the operating department's responsibility. Although I could see coming -- let me put it that way -- I could see coming down the road where this was going to become of greater and greater importance to any company in the United States.

Q Okay.

A I could almost see this coming at the time, you know.

But, as far as the mechanical department was concerned, we would not be called in on a major derailment of this sort. It would be the operating department then that would handle it.

Q If there was an emergency repair necessary, again, would that be --

A Huh?

Q I said, if there was an emergency repair necessary in a given situation, that would be also under the operating department, or the yard supervisors?

A That would be the yard supervisors, yeah, not the operating department, or the car inspectors that worked in the yard, or the car repairmen that worked on the rip track. You know, we had a lot of little rip tracks where a car would come in, it needed a -- broke a pipe, or something like that, and they would replace the pipe --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- or something like that.

MR. RUVOLO: Okay. I have no further questions. Thank you, Mr. McGuigan.

THE WITNESS: Hope I helped you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:

Q I have a few questions, Mr. McGuigan. My name is Pierce Cunningham.

A My name is McGuigan, Pierce. If you see it in writing, you can't pronounce it, so don't even look at it in writing.

Q Well, my grandfather was from Ireland. His name was McGaugh, M-c-G-a-u-g-h, and no one else ever knew how to pronounce that, so you may have something in common here.

With respect to your employment, as I understand it, you would have worked for Penn Central, or something similar to Penn Central, between 1948 and 1976; is that right?

A Yes.

Q It is my understanding, further, that you had nothing to do whatsoever with Elkhart, Indiana, railyard, other than perhaps from some distant administrative post; is that right?

A That's right.

Q You knew where it was. But as far as the daily operations, you had nothing to do with Elkhart, Indiana; is that right?

A Uh-huh.

Q And, primarily, your responsibilities were, as you rose through the ranks, the mechanical division of the Penn Central, and you eventually rose to be the chief mechanical officer; is that right?

A Right, right. I finally attained that exalted position, yes.

Q Right. And most of your life then was spent in the administrative end rather than, shall we say, the shop end; is that right?

A Yes. I did not -- I didn't perform work in the shops.

Q What about the reporting of hazardous spills, let's say, in the late '60s, between 1965 and 1970. Do you have any recollection, Mr. McGuigan, of how such spills were reported, or how they were handled by Penn Central at that time? In terms of the paperwork, let's say.

A What kind of paperwork?

Q Well, that's what I want to know. Was there any paperwork associated with, let's say, the spill of the contents of a tank car into the ground in those days?

A Not that I can recall.

Q From a fire standpoint, do you recall whether there was any kind of procedure in place to notify

13 -

those in command from the field level up between 1965 and 1970? Or would that be someone else's department?

- A I don't understand your question.
- Q All right. It's not the clearest thing in the world.

Would you have knowledge of whether or not there existed as a procedure at Penn Central between 1965 and 1970 a method of reporting spills in railyards?

- A I don't recall. I really don't recall.
- Q Probably Mr. Manganaro may be the better person to ask there; is that right?
 - 'A Well --
 - Q Because he was in the department --
- A He was more intimately involved in doing environmental work than anyone else that I can recall.

See, on the railroad, the operating department was the department in charge of clearing wrecks. They had possession of the waybills. They would -- they would be the ones that would have the knowledge of the contents of the cars.

Q All right. I was going to ask you a few questions about that. Who was the head of the operating department in the days that I'm talking about, '65 to '70?

A Oh, God. Well, I think -- I think -- I've got a problem with the semantics here. The operating department consisted of three major subdepartments: the mechanical department, the engineering department and the transportation department.

The operating -- the head of the operating department was the executive vice-president of operations. He was the man that I worked for.

- Q And who was that in this case? Do you recall?
- A The last one that I worked for was Mr. Flannery, and the one before that was Mr. Smucker.
- Q Okay. And those gentlemen, are they still living?
 - A I have no idea.
 - Q Do you have any idea where they are?
- A I do not.
 - Q I assume they worked with you in Philadelphia; is that right?
 - A Yes.
 - Q So, when you refer to, in your testimony, the operating department was responsible for cleanup, waybills, et cetera, those were the gentlemen who would have knowledge of those kinds of things?
 - A Well, I should have probably said the transportation department, the transportation

23

24

25

department. Q Okav. We always used to refer to it as the operating department. * Q And Flannery was then the head of the transportation department? No. Α Who was head of the transportation department Q during the time we're talking about? He would be my colleague, and that would be, I think, Hasselman. Hasselman was head of the transportation department. Gordon was head of the engineering department. And Wiggin was head of the mechanical department. So, during the mid-'60s to '70s, they were the key players. Well, no. Wait a minute. They --Is that --I was not made chief mechanical officer until 19-- -- January 1, 1970. Or was it '71? Let me think. 171.

But, thinking back five years before that, Q Hasselman would have been head of the transportation department?

Five years before then, I was not chief

mechanical officer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q Right. I'm trying to find out who in transportation would have been --
 - A Well -- .
 - Q -- the key players.
- A Well, let's see, Hasselman -- no, it would be before Hasselman. It would probably be Mose Harris,

 A. M. Harris.
 - Q So there was an A. M. Harris, then Hasselman?
- A Then Hasselman, yes.
 - Q Where are those gentlemen now?
- 12 A I have no idea.
 - Q So you have sort of lost track of them?
- 14 A Yes.
 - Q Again, they were in Philadelphia.
 - A That's right.
 - Q I think it was your testimony that, although Penn Central was pinching pennies towards the end, which would be in the early '70s, there were no shortcuts in the area of safety.
 - A None at all. No, no. I insisted on that. There were no --
 - Q Okav.
 - A No. We would simply put a car aside. If we didn't have the money to repair that car or locomotive,

2'

we would just simply set that aside. I would not permit the work to be done on our equipment that was unsafe, was not up to standard. I would not -- I would not do that.

Q Okay. You've been shown Exhibit A, and you recall generally what that memo was. And that is an example of concern for safety; was it not?

A Oh, I consider it to be; yes.

Q And its purpose, as I read it -- correct me if I'm wrong -- is primarily for a fire -- to prevent a fire hazard; isn't that right?

A Well, I don't -- as I said before, I'm not familiar with this. This is the first time -- I may have seen this before, but this is the first time I've seen it in years. If I have seen it before, I don't remember that.

Q Calling your attention to, for example, this last paragraph of page one of the memo, wherein it states, "It will be necessary to reeducate some of our personnel so that they do not smoke or use flames where petroleum distillates are being used." What does that mean? Does that assist you (tendering document)?

A Well, let's see here. (Examining document.)

If I interpret this memo correctly, chlorinated

solvents were discontinued because of the fire hazard.

'	. Q ORAY, THAT S WHAT I WAITED TO KHOW! I CHITIK
2	you've answered my question.
3	A That's my interpretation.
4	Q Well, I thought that memo was intended for it
5	MR. CUNNINGHAM: And I thank you. That's al
6	the questions I have.
7	CROSS-EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. ERMILIO:
9	Q Mr. McGuigan, my name is Jim Ermilio, and
10	represent Conrail, as I explained earlier. Just a
1 7	couple brief questions.
12	You mentioned that you did not author the mem
13	that is Exhibit A. You didn't write that.
14	A No, no.
15	Q Do you remember seeing the memo back during
16	that time period?

A No.

Q Do you know what the purpose of the memo was, other than your interpretation today as you read through it?

A Other than my interpretation today, this is the first time I've seen it. I don't know -- I have no idea what the background of this might be.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}$ You mentioned that Mr. Reed and Mr. Noonan authored the memo.

Q

1

2 Mr. Noonan's initials; yes. 3 Did you speak to Mr. Noonan around the time 4 that he wrote that memo? 5 No . I never saw this. I don't recall even seeing this. 6 You didn't discuss it with him, either? 7. No. 8 9 So you don't know why he wrote it? 10 No. Do you know what effect that memo had on the 11 use of chlorinated solvents around the system? 12 13 I presume they discontinued using it, because I told them not to use it. 14 15 Discontinued using it effective immediately? 16 Well, that's what the letter says; yeah. And if a memo was sent like that, would that 17 instruction be followed across the system? 18 19 Well, the -- it's like everything else. 20 To the best of your knowledge. 21 To the best of my knowledge, it would be, yes. 22 And whether it was followed or not, it would probably 23 be followed up by either Mr. Reed or Mr. Noonan or 24 someone.

Was that a general procedure for Mr. Reed and

This memo was written by R.T.N., which is

Mr. Noonan?

A It depended upon -- it depended upon the circumstances.

Q Okay.

A If it was something that was critical to us, it certainly would be followed up very closely. But if it was something in the ordinary course of business, it could fall into a category of instructions going out to the field from headquarters.

I'm certainly not naive enough to think that everything that was sent out from headquarters was followed 100 percent. It was our intent that they should be, let's put it that way.

Q Do you know whether these instructions were followed?

A No, I don't.

Q Would Mr. Reed or Mr. Noonan be the ones to answer that question?

A I have no idea. You'd have to ask them.

Q Okay. Do you remember any discussion of the use of chlorinated solvents back during that time period?

A No.

MR. ERMILIO: I have no further questions.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I just have a couple with

1 regard -- I'm sorry, Peter. 2 MR. RUVOLO: That's okav. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'll finish up. I had it on 3 my mind, and it's only a few. 4 FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. CUNNINGHAM: 6 Reed, Noonan and those people were in a separate department. They were in the chemical --8 They were in what I would term a subdepartment 9 10 of our engineering section. Mr. Harley was our general 11 superintendent of equipment engineering. And Mr. Reed 12 and Mr. Noonan and other technical people of that 13 nature, they would work for Mr. Harley. And Mr. Harley worked for me. 14 15 Q How large a department was that that dealt with chemical substances that were used? 16 17 I don't -- I don't remember how large it was. 18 Well, approximately. 19 · A Well, I know there were more than Noonan and 20 Reed in it, but I don't know. I don't know. 21 Q Did they have their own laboratory? 22 Α There was a laboratory in existence in Collingwood, outside of Cleveland. Whether that --23 whether that laboratory was used in this particular 24

circumstance, I do not know.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's all the questions I have.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RUVOLO:

. 24

Q I think what you were trying, in answer to Mr. Ermilio's questions, was that, at times like -- that were going on, you know, between cost cutting and people trying to make their points in administrative ways, et cetera, you had no way of knowing whether a memo such as that would be carried out; isn't that true?

A Say that again. I can't quite understand what you mean by it.

- Q The company has financial problems.
- A Yes, yes.
- Q Okay. You're in a cost-cutting mode, and you have people that work for the company that will react in different ways when they are ordered to cut costs. So that if there were a policy that came down that they could save money on by not implementing right away, you have no -- the chances are that it might have been left the same, correct?
 - MR. ERMILIO: Objection.
 - MR. RUVOLO: It's a very poorly-stated question.

THE WITNESS: I really don't know. I can't answer that question.

BY MR. RUVOLO:

- Q Were there any instances that came to your attention where you know people did not follow a directive such as that?
 - A No, no. No, no.
- Q Were there any disciplinary procedures put into effect in case people didn't follow a directive such as that? Or any other safety directive?

A Well, a directive of this nature, which was sent out to the field, it would be to the people that were addressed at the top of the letter, to take this particular instruction and disseminate it to the various little shops and filling stations and what have you that were under their jurisdiction.

Q I see.

A They were the ones that had the ultimate responsibility to see that these particular instructions were carried out. This -- if they failed to do this? Yes, it would be grounds for discipline. It would be grounds for discipline. Because this is a letter from the chief mechanical officer that should be followed out by the people in the field.

That's the general procedure. As far as me,

myself, going out to Elkhart at 3:00 o'clock in the 1. 2 morning to see if this particular solvent was used. no. that would not -- that would not be my function. 3 And if I could ask you: What have you been 5 doing since 1976? 6 Playing golf. 7 Playing golf. 8 No. I have to take that back. When I left -when I left Penn Central, I came down here and worked 9 10 at CSX. I retired from CSX. I worked for the Seaboard 11 Coast Line. I came down here, I think, on a -- the 12 property was conveyed to Conrail on April 1, 1976, and 13 I started working down here on April the 4th, 1976, as system vice-president of operations for the Seaboard 14 15 Coast Line. I subsequently retired from CSX in 1986,

MR. RUVOLO: Thank you.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's all.

MR. ERMILIO: No questions. We're finished.

(Witness excused.)

(Thereupon, the deposition was concluded at approximately 11:15 a.m.)

23

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

January 1, 1986.

24

25

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF FLORIDA)

1

2

3

5

6

7

8.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNTY OF DUVAL)

I. Elizabeth M. Baxley, RPR-CP, and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, do hereby certify that pursuant to Notice of Taking Deposition in the above-entitled cause, I sat at the U.S. Attorney's Office, 311 West Monroe Street, Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida, at the time stated hereinabove, and was attended by PETER H. RUVOLO, Esquire, on behalf of the United States of America; JAMES A. ERMILIO, Esquire, Attorney for Consolidated Rail Corporation; PIERCE E. CUNNINGHAM, Esquire, Attorney for Penn Central Corporation; and the witness, J. M. McGUIGAN, who was by me first duly cautioned and sworn to testify the whole truth, and carefully examined, thereupon testified as is hereinabove shown, and that the testimony of said witness was reduced to typewriting under my personal supervision.

I further certify that pursuant to stipulation by and between counsel for the respective parties, and the witness, that the reading and signing of the deposition by the witness was waived.

I further certify that I am neither counsel nor attorney to any of the parties in said cause, nor

relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, nor financially interested in the result of the said cause.

I further certify that I have delivered the original of this transcript to PETER H. RUVOLO, Esquire, on behalf of the United States of America.

wITNESS my hand and official seal in the City of Jacksonville, County of Duval, State of Florida, this day of March, A.D., 1993.

Elizabeth M. Baxley

OFFICIAL NOTARY SEAL
ELIZABETH M BAXLEY
NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF FLORIDA
COMMISSION NO. CC194192
MY COMMISSION EXP. APR. 16,1996